



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/007,299	11/08/2001	Giovanni B. Marchisio	480193.402	5356

500 7590 12/27/2006
SEED INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP PLLC
701 FIFTH AVE
SUITE 5400
SEATTLE, WA 98104

EXAMINER

SKED, MATTHEW J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	12/27/2006	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/007,299	MARCHISIO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Matthew J. Sked	2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-13, 15-38, 40-49, 81-106 and 119-141 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 81-88 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-13, 15-38, 40-49, 89-97, 101-103 and 119-141 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 98-100 and 104-106 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 10/19/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As per claims 2, 26 and 27, the Applicant states that Tsourikov et al. (U.S. Pat Pub. 2002/0010574A1) does not teach "wherein the additional grammatical role indicates that the at least one of the meaningful terms is a subject or an object in addition to the grammatical role determined from the parse structure." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the Applicant states that Tsourikov does not teach "the use of a grammatical role that is not determined from the parse structure, let alone one that is a subject or an object." Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). The claim language states that the additional grammatical role is a subject or an object and this additional grammatical role is in addition to the grammatical role determined from the parse structure. At no point does the claim language state that the additional role, which is a subject or object, cannot be determined from the parse structure. Therefore, Tsourikov's teaching of developing multiple sets of fields each indicating the roles of terms, wherein the role is an object, clearly meets the limits and bounds of the claim language.

The rejections stand.

2. In response to applicant's arguments to claims 89, 93 and 94, the recitation "having a plurality of units that are specified according to an object-specific grammar" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). Therefore, because nowhere in the body of the claim does the Applicant state that the units of the object are generated with the use of a object-specific grammar and the body of the claim is able to stand alone without the limitation, the limitation has not been given patentable weight by the Examiner.

It is noted that the newly cited reference Chang et al. (U.S. Pat Pub. 2004/0125877A1) teaches a system for parsing a video object using a specified grammar (see abstract).

3. Applicant's arguments, in view of the amendments, filed 10/19/06, with respect to claims 81, 84-86, 98-100 and 104-106 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 81-88 has been withdrawn.

4. It is noted that the applicant did not traverse the Official Notice taken in the previous Office Action and therefore it is taken to be admitted prior art (see MPEP 2144.03).

The Applicant also argues that there is no motivation in the Tsourikov reference to modify his invention as described in claims 24 and 140. The examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or **in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art**. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In claims 24 and 140, a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time would recognize the benefit of adding synonyms (related verbs) to a search query because it would expand the query and give more results.

The rejection stands.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 2-13, 15-23, 25, 26-38, 40-49, 95-97, 101-103, 119-137 and 139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsourikov et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. 2002/0010574A1).

As per claims 2, 26, and 27, Tsourikov teaches a method, computer-readable medium and a syntactic query engine in a computer system for transforming a document of a data set into a canonical representation, the document having a plurality of sentences, each sentence having a plurality of terms, comprising:

for each sentence, parsing the sentence to generate a parse structure having a plurality of syntactic elements (part-of-speech tagging and parsing, Fig. 4, elements 36 and 38);

determining a set of meaningful terms of the sentence from the syntactic elements (detects introductory words and excludes them hence the remaining words are meaningful, paragraphs 93-104);

determining from the structure of the parse structure and the syntactic elements a grammatical role for each meaningful term in the set of meaningful terms, wherein the grammatical role is a verb (eSAO extraction extracts the action, paragraphs 191-201 and 282-289);

determining an additional grammatical role for at least one of the meaningful terms, such that the at least one meaningful term is associated with at least two different grammatical roles, wherein the additional grammatical role indicates that the at least one of the meaningful terms is an object (determines multiple sets of fields and therefore determines additional grammatical roles of the terms, wherein this additional role is an object, paragraphs 268-289); and

storing in an enhanced data representation data structure a representation of each association between a meaningful term and its determined grammatical roles, in a

manner that indicates a grammatical relationship between a plurality of the meaningful terms and such that at least one meaningful term is associated with a plurality of grammatical relationships (stores the eSAO structure in memory for searching, paragraph 426).

7. As per claims 3, 28 and 122, Tsourikov teaches wherein heuristics are used to determine the additional grammatical role for the at least one of the meaningful terms (eSAO uses models that describe rules, paragraphs 191-201).

8. As per claims 4-10, 29-35 and 123-129, Tsourikov teaches that multiple sets of fields are possible for any given input hence suggesting that any combination of rules that are claimed would be possible (paragraphs 268-289).

9. As per claims 11, 36 and 130, Tsourikov teaches wherein the determined additional grammatical role is a part of grammar that is not implied by the position of the at least one meaningful term relative to the structure of the sentence (additional role not implied by the position, paragraphs 268-289).

10. As per claims 12, 37 and 131, Tsourikov teaches wherein heuristics are used to determine which grammatical relationships are to be stored in the enhanced data representation data structure (algorithms control which relations to extract from the document, paragraph 204).

11. As per claims 13, 38 and 132, Tsourikov teaches wherein the determining the grammatical role for each meaningful term and the determining of the additional grammatical role for at least one of the meaningful terms yields a plurality of grammatical relationships between meaningful terms that are identical (after both sets

Art Unit: 2626

of roles are extracted many fields are empty hence the relationships are identical and redundant, paragraphs 268-289).

12. As per claims 15, 40 and 133, Tsourikov teaches wherein the document is part of a corpus of heterogeneous documents (source documents, paragraph 426).

13. As per claims 16, 41 and 134, Tsourikov teaches wherein the enhanced data representation data structure is used to index a corpus of documents (Fig. 8, element 90).

14. As per claims 17, 42 and 135, Tsourikov teaches wherein the enhanced data representation data structure is used to execute a query against objects in a corpus of documents (Fig. 8, element 94).

15. As per claims 18, 43 and 136, Tsourikov teaches wherein the enhance data representation data structure corresponds to the query and results are returned that satisfy the query when an object in the corpus contains similar terms associated with similar grammatical roles to the terms and their associated roles as stored in the enhanced data representation that corresponds to the query (identifies the eSAO structures of the source documents that match the eSAO search patterns of the query, paragraph 426).

16. As per claims 19 and 44, Tsourikov teaches wherein the objects in the corpus are sentences and indications of sentences that satisfy the query are returned (objects are sentences and returns full source sentence to the user, paragraphs 211-218 and 426).

Art Unit: 2626

17. As per claims 20 and 45, Tsourikov teaches returning indications of documents that contain similar terms to those found in at least one sentence that was indicated in the results returned that satisfied the query (returns link to the full source document, paragraph 426).

18. As per claims 21 and 46, Tsourikov teaches returning indications of documents that contain similar terms to those found in at least one document that was indicated in the results returned that satisfied the query (returns link to the full source document, paragraph 426).

19. As per claims 22 and 47, Tsourikov teaches the enhanced data structure corresponds to the query and terms that are associated with designated grammatical roles are returned for each object in the corpus that contains similar terms associated with similar grammatical roles to the terms and associated roles of designated relationships from the enhanced data representation data structure that corresponds to the query (displays the structures to the user, paragraph 426).

20. As per claims 23, 48 and 139, Tsourikov teaches adding additional grammatical relationships to the enhanced data representation structure to be used to execute the query against objects in a corpus of documents (forms less relevant search patterns, paragraphs 404-425).

21. As per claims 25, 49 and 137, Tsourikov teaches wherein weighted results that satisfy the query are returned (returns results in order of relevance, paragraph 426).

Art Unit: 2626

22. As per claims 95 and 101, Tsourikov teaches wherein the returned indications of sentences are indications of paragraphs (displays associated paragraph, paragraph 426).

23. As per claims 96 and 102, Tsourikov teaches wherein the returned indications of sentences are indications of documents (sentences includes link to document, paragraph 426).

24. As per claims 97 and 103, Tsourikov teaches wherein the at least one sentence that was indicated in the result is a paragraph (displays associated paragraph, paragraph 426).

25. As per claim 119, Tsourikov teaches wherein an enhanced data representation data structure is generated for a plurality of sentences of each document in a corpus of documents as part of indexing the corpus, and further comprising:

receiving a query that specifies only a portion of a grammatical relationship between two terms, the portion being a specification of the relationship of a specification of one of the two terms but not both terms (question queries ignore the question words hence only specifying the other terms in the query, paragraphs 230-232 and 368-378);

transforming the query into an enhanced data representation data structure (paragraphs 368-378); and

comparing the enhanced data representation data structure of the query against the enhanced data representation data structures of each indexed sentence such that indications of sentences are returned as matches when the enhanced data representation data structure of the query matches at least one of the enhance data

Art Unit: 2626

representation data structures of the indexed sentence by using a wildcard to match unspecified information in the grammatical relationship indicated by the enhanced data representation data structure of the query (searches for a relevant eSAO structure corresponding the query structure and uses the term "any" in fields as a wildcard, paragraphs 368-378 and 426).

26. As per claim 120, Tsourikov teaches wherein the query specifies only an action (a bit sentence with only an action would have a query structure with only an action, paragraphs 336-356).

27. As per claim 121, Tsourikov teaches wherein the query specifies a single term as either a subject or an object, and the method returns a matching result when the term appears in an enhanced data representation data structure of an indexed sentence as an object or as a subject (single object term that would return documents with structures with objects that match the object term, paragraphs 336-347 and 426).

28. As per claims 138 and 141, Tsourikov teaches wherein the query processor associates a wildcard with the query to generate results that satisfy the query (incorporates the term "any" in the query to generate results that satisfy that query, paragraphs 336-356 and 426).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

29. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

Art Unit: 2626

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

30. Claims 24 and 140 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsourikov in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

Tsourikov does not teach wherein at least one of entailed verbs or related verbs are used to add additional grammatical relationships.

Applicant's admitted prior art teaches that incorporating synonyms of terms in a search query is well known. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Tsourikov to add additional grammatical relationships by using related verbs because it would increase the amount of relevant documents returned.

31. Claims 89-94 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsourikov in view of Arnold et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,910,003).

Tsourikov teaches a method, computer-readable memory and a query engine in a computer system for transforming an object of a data set into a canonical representation for use in indexing the objects of the data set and in querying the data set and having a plurality of units that are specified according to an object-specific grammar, comprising:

for each object, decomposing the object to generate a parse structure having a plurality of syntactic elements (part-of-speech tagging and parsing, Fig. 4, elements 36 and 38);

determining a set of meaningful units of the object from these syntactic elements (detects introductory words and excludes them hence the remaining words are meaningful, paragraphs 93-104);

determining from the structure of the parse structure and the syntactic elements a grammatical role for each meaningful unit (eSAO extraction extracts the grammatical roles from the input, paragraphs 191-201 and 282-289);and

storing in an enhanced data representation data structure a representation of each meaningful unit associated with its determined grammatical role, in a manner that indicates a grammatical relationship between a plurality of the meaningful units (stores each word with its indexes (stores the eSAO structure in memory for searching, paragraph 426).

Tsourikov does not teach the object being other than a text-only document, such as audio, video and images.

Arnold teaches a system for indexing and searching a plurality of documents found on the web, which would include html information (which would include images), speech, video and audio (col. 5, lines 59-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the system of Tsourikov to index objects other than text-only documents as taught by Arnold because it would allow multimedia documents to be indexed and retrieved hence making a more useful system.

Allowable Subject Matter

32. Claims 81-88 are allowed.

33. Claims 98-100 and 104-106 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

34. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: None of the prior art on record teaches a method for creating a data structure representing a document using a subject table, an object table, a subject-object table and a noun-modifier table. Also none of the prior art teaches using Latent Semantic Regression techniques. It would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the prior art on record to arrive at the Applicant's invention.

Conclusion

35. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Chang et al. (U.S. Pat Pub. 2004/0125877A1) teaches a system for parsing a video object using a specified grammar (see abstract).

36. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew J. Sked whose telephone number is (571) 272-7627. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MS

12/18/06



DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600